



Value of Title to Ingalls' Seat for the Second Term.

The triumph of John J. Ingalls, on January 29th, 1873, to a seat in the senate, showed that he had about ninety per cent. of the vote cast, consequent upon Pomeroy's collapse. On January 31, 1879, after a four days' struggle he had about fifty-one per cent. of the legislative vote, having had four majority in the senate, while in the house of representatives he lacked one vote of a majority.

The senators were elected in 1876 and the representatives in 1878; so it may be noticed that after the most violent efforts to obtain an enduring strength in the popular branch of the legislature, Senator Ingalls obtained sixty-four out of the 129 members. The Kansas house of representatives on February 6th, 1879 on a question of privilege, adopted a resolution offered by Hon. Dexter E. Clapp, by a vote of sixty-eight to fifty-six.

PROVISION FOR INVESTIGATION OF THE ELECTION.

The preambles and resolutions adopted charged bribery and corruption in the matter of the election of United States senator, and a committee of five was appointed by the speaker of the house to institute an investigation into the charges of wrong doing, connected with the senatorial election. This investigating committee presented three reports, one of which was signed by three of the members; and the others, each by one member. In one of these reports the following language occurs:

Senator Ingalls, James S. Merritt, J. S. Danford and Calvin Hood, employed corrupt and illegal means to secure the election of the said J. J. Ingalls to the United States senate, and but for said improper influences his election would not have been obtained.

An individual member of the committee said:

"The senatorial elector should live in an atmosphere of purity; his person should be unapproachable, and his conclusions and judgment should be held as sacred as the deliberations of the juror in the box, or of the judge upon the bench."

INVESTIGATION TRANSFERRED FROM TOPEKA TO WASHINGTON.

The United States senate was memorialized by members of the Kansas legislature, and Senator Ingalls' case finally came before the senate committee on privileges and elections, and in September 1879, a sub-committee of the same, came to Topeka to take testimony, consisting of Senators Saulsbury, of Delaware, Vance, of North Carolina, Bailey, of Tennessee, Logan, of Illinois, and Cameron, of Wisconsin.

The committee made their report on

February 17, 1880—twelve and one-half months after Ingalls' election, returning a sort of Scotch verdict, and receiving a discharge.

The result arrived at, appears below; and a minority report, signed by Senators Cameron, Logan and Hoar imply corruption on all lines of the contest; especially in the opposition:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

Resolved, that the testimony taken by the committee, proves that bribery and other corrupt means were employed by persons favoring the election of Hon. John J. Ingalls to the senate to obtain for him the vote of members of the legislature of Kansas in the senatorial election in that state. But it is not proved by the testimony that enough votes were secured by such means to determine the result of the election in his favor nor is it shown that Senator Ingalls authorized acts of bribery to secure his election.

MINORITY REPORT.

We concur in part of the report. We exonerate Mr. Ingalls from any complicity with improper practices. We also find that the result of the election was not accomplished by such practices. We think that when the report goes further and finds that persons favoring Mr. Ingalls' election were guilty of such practices, it should in justice state what was clearly and unquestionably proved that such means were employed in opposition to his election.

UTTERANCES FROM THE TOPEKA CAPITAL.

As an evidence of fair speech and candor with one's readers, the *Capital* of February 19, said:

The verdict of the senate committee against Mr. Ingalls' advisers and managers is a verdict against him and the judgment of his constituents at home will so consider it notwithstanding his technical acquittal. The men who manipulated the fireling legislators were not mere clerks; they were interested advisers, personal friends and trusted confidential agents, and the common sophistry offered to excuse a sensational candidate who purchases the votes of commercial members is that people should send better men.

The political power of Mr. Ingalls is gone. He could not be re-elected to-day, and he has nobody to thank for this fall but himself. He will take his place in the political mausoleum of Kansas, among those who failed to remember the simple lesson that honesty is the best policy.

"THE REPUBLICANS OF KANSAS DO NOT NEED A DICTATOR."

So said the *Capital* in its issue of February 26, 1880, and its continued statements are these:

Mr. Ingalls is in a condition to be let alone. An attempt on the part of his friends to make an Ingalls issue in our state politics, would meet with marked failure. The ring of politicians who have championed Mr. Ingalls ought not to require notice that they do not control the republicans of Kansas. The plain truth is the election was a disgrace to the republican party, and to Kansas at home and abroad.

INGALLS' EXHIBITION OF HIMSELF, AFTER SEVEN YEARS.

The *Capital* of March 4, thus speaks of the vindication (?) of this man seven years a senator:

The drunken spree at Atchison to celebrate the vindication of our senator was a fitting accom-

paniment to the vulgar speech of the political demagogue whom the drunken crowd applauded. If a disappointed ward politician made such a speech he would be denounced as an injudicious fool, but coming from a United States senator representing an intelligent people it is an outrage which nothing will justify. The speech lifts the mask from the statesman and shows the narrow petty demagogue who brazenly proclaims his own purity, while he besmirches the character of men in every respect his superiors. The wit and keen sarcasm of the Senator's Atchison speech would well become a brothel in a saloon, but offered to the state of Kansas it insults common decency. Do Senator Ingalls' friends justify this brutal ill-bred attack on men like Horton, Guthrie, Anderson and others?

THE REMARKS AT THE FUNERAL.

Under this heading the *Capital* gives the following from Web Wilder on the vindication spree:

Ingalls says he has been five times vindicated; first when he bought his seat; second, when he was investigated at Topeka; third, when he was investigated at Washington; fourth, when it was declared that his seat was obtained by bribery and corruption, and fifth, when the railroad gave him free passes to bring a throng of idle lookers on to Atchison to hear his last dying words and confession. That is the Atchison definition of "vindicated," and five of them piled on each other would kill the meanest wretch who ever picked a pocket or robbed a grave.

WHEN'S THE REPUBLICAN NEWSPAPER SAY HE IS VINDICATED?

Has the New York Times or Tribune said so? Has the Boston Journal or Traveler or Advertiser, published in his native state declared that Ingalls held his seat honorably? Has any paper in Chicago, Cincinnati, or St. Louis of any politics said or hinted that Ingalls was innocent, that he had not bought his seat, that he was not guilty of corruption? Not one. And there never will be one. And yet the press is generous; the American people do not wrongfully pursue an innocent man. When they find that false charges have been made, they rush to the rescue of the person wrongly accused and proudly and triumphantly wash away the stain, placing them higher in their confidence and honor than the man who has gone through life blamelessly and without reproach.

Mr. Ingalls is on one side, the people on the other. He declares his innocence spitefully and with tiresome reiteration. But nobody believes him. It is one man against all his countrymen. We must change the proverb what one man says must be true.

A MOST BEAUTIFUL PEN PICTURE!

And thus the moral portraiture continues:

These bitter personalities in which the briber has indulged, will bring fruit after their kind. The war upon him has not yet opened. He chooses to talk about private character—he, the most rotten of men in his relations with men and with women; in his relations as a lawyer and as a politician; the lawyer who sought to bribe judges, and who made clients pay three times for a farm, the unmarried citizen of Sumner whose children bear their mothers' name; the married man who stole an estate from a widow; the senator who appointed convicts to office and who stole and burned the telegraphic proofs of his guilt. This is the creature who in his defeat and in his infamy so far forgot his cunning as to challenge the publication of his private history.

Five vindications he has had. He courts more and he will have them. Personal and political results will flow from these words from his coffin. Ingalls' first seat in the senate was secured by the York intrigue, which he helped to concoct, and his second, was obtained by purchase. He is a cipher and a coward in the senate where he never dared make but one speech, and he is a disgrace to Kansas to whose proud name his history has added nothing but infamy and dishonor.

The reader will observe that the above choice contributions to the literature of Kansas are all from the columns of the *Topeka Capital*. We disclaim all responsibility for their production. THE ADVOCATE would not to-day say as mean things of our Senator, and we desire even now to apologize for sending such literature to the homes of our readers. Nothing but regard for public duty would induce us to do it. Its purpose is to illustrate the consistency of partisan journalism. This same *Capital* is now lending its influence for the return of this same John J. Ingalls to the United States Senate to still further disgrace the fair name of our state. EDITOR.

Both Men and Money.

In a recent lecture, Professor Brewer, of Yale College, illustrated the idea that "man is worth more than the land" by a case which came under his own observation. A man bought a farm for \$30 an acre. He so improved it that in a few years he was offered \$300 an acre for it. At his death he sold it for \$250 an acre. In a few years the purchaser sold it for \$100 an acre to a man who finally disposed of it for \$12 an acre. Here it was plainly the men and not the farm that determined the value.—*Manhattan Industrialist*.

That item comes from one of the fountains of knowledge in this state, supported at public expense.

Now will the *Industrialist* tell us why the farms of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois and a dozen other states have fallen in price without change of owners? Evidently, the number of dollars afloat have something to do with the monetary value of farms and other property?

"That commodities would rise and fall in price, in proportion to the increase and diminution of money, I assume as a fact that is incontrovertible. That such would be the case all celebrated writers are agreed."—Ricardo, of England.

How strange that the leading teachers of society can scarcely keep up with the country school boys in their own fields of practical research!

On the first day of January, 1887, Governor Foraker stated publicly that "Farm property in Ohio has fallen 25 to 50 per cent. since 1880." Wonder if those Ohio farms had pretty generally changed owners! In questions of price both men and money must be considered.—*Junction City Tribune*.